

9 *Pytilia melba clanceyi* Wolters, 1963, J. Orn., p. 186. Wau, southern Sudan, appears to be based upon a population intermediate between *citerior* Strickland and *soudanensis* (Sharpe). The extent to which separate status should be given to intergrading populations in this species is a matter of opinion.

10 *Estrilda erythronotos soligena* Clancey, 1964, Durban Mus. Nov. 7, p. 139. Otjimassu, South West Africa. Good series examined does not support the validity of this form.

11 *Lagonosticta rufopicta* (Fraser)

In 1963 in the *Check List* I treated *plumbaria* Clancey, from Ngamiland as a synonym of *nitidula*. I have now examined the material in the National Museum, Bulawayo. Birds from Ngamiland north to the southern Barotse province in Zambia are slightly greyer and less brown above than *nitidula* (Hartlaub), slightly paler below and lacking any fawn wash on the abdomen. It is recognisable though not strongly differentiated.

12 *Spermestes cucullatus tessellatus* Clancey, 1964, Occas. Pap. nat. Mus. S. Rhod. 4 (27 B), p. 28. Natal. I cannot separate this form from *scutatus* (Heuglin).

A recently described African Swift

by C. M. N. WHITE

Received 8th November, 1965

Friedmann in *Contributions to Science*, no. 83, December 8th, 1964 has described *Apus pallidus kapnodes* as a new subspecies from Mt. Maroto, Uganda. It is said to resemble *somalicus* (Clarke) but to be darker and slightly larger. In fact it is evident that Friedmann has redescribed *Apus niansae* (Reichenow). The diagnosis and measurements quoted make this quite clear. When Friedmann states that *niansae* examined by him are larger than *kapnodes* with wing over 170 mm. it is apparent that these are *Apus barbatus roehli* Reichenow, and were misidentified as *niansae* which in turn led to the naming of *kapnodes*. I am grateful to Dr. Friedmann for lending a specimen of *A. p. kapnodes* to the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) and to Mrs. B. P. Hall for examining it and confirming these conclusions.

Apparent zoogeographical dispersal patterns in two avian families

by C. J. O. HARRISON

(continued from page 56)

2. ESTRILDIDAE

This family has undergone several different taxonomic rearrangements and reappraisals during recent years. Delacour (1943), Wolters (1957) and Steiner (1960) have all proposed new arrangements. Delacour lumped species together to form fewer and larger genera, while the others tended to restore earlier subdivisions. The fact that the species within this family are relatively easy to keep in captivity, coupled with a lack of useful morphological characters for subdivision within the family of relatively similar species has led to a study of their comparative ethology, behavioural characters being used in the study of taxonomic relationship. Morris (1958)